arXiv:math/9602202v1 [math.CV] 26 Feb 1996

ON THE PRODUCT PROPERTY OF THE PLURICOMPLEX GREEN FUNCTION

Armen Edigarian

Abstract. We prove that the pluricomplex Green function has the product property $g_{D_1\times D_2}=\max\{g_{D_1},g_{D_2}\}$ for any domains $D_1\subset\mathbb{C}^n$ and $D_2\subset\mathbb{C}^m$.

Let E denote the unit disc in $\mathbb{C}$. For any domain $G\subset\mathbb{C}^n$ define

$$g_D(a,z):=\inf_{\substack{\varphi\in\mathcal{O}(E,D)\\ \varphi(0)=z\\ a\in\varphi(E)}}\Big\{\prod_{\lambda\in\varphi^{-1}(a)}|\lambda|^{\operatorname{ord}_\lambda(\varphi-a)}\Big\},\quad a,z\in D,$$

where $\mathcal{O}(E,D)$ denotes the set of all holomorphic mappings $E\to D$ and $\operatorname{ord}_\lambda(\varphi-a)$ denotes multiplicity of $\varphi-a$ at λ.

The function g_D is proposed by Poletsky (cf. [Pol]) and is called the *pluricomplex Green function for D*. We have that (see [Jar-Pfl1], Chapter IV)

$$\text{(a)}\qquad g_D(a,z):=\inf_{\substack{\varphi\in\mathcal{O}(\overline{E},D)\\ \varphi(0)=z\\ a\in\varphi(E)}}\Big\{\prod_{\lambda\in\varphi^{-1}(a)}|\lambda|^{\operatorname{ord}_\lambda(\varphi-a)}\Big\},\quad a,z\in D.$$

Note that in the formula (a) we take only $\lambda\in\varphi^{-1}(a)$ such that $\lambda\in E$;
(b) For any domains D_1, D_2 and any holomorphic mapping $f:D_1\to D_2$ we have the following contractible property: $g_{D_2}\big(f(z),f(w)\big)\le g_{D_1}(z,w)$, $z,w\in D_1$.

The main result of the paper is the following product property.

Theorem 1. *Let $D_1\subset\mathbb{C}^n$ and $D_2\subset\mathbb{C}^m$ be domains. Then*

$$g_{D_1\times D_2}\big((z_1,w_1),(z_2,w_2)\big)=\max\{g_{D_1}(z_1,z_2),g_{D_2}(w_1,w_2)\},\qquad (z_1,w_1),(z_2,w_2)\in D_1\times D_2.$$

Remark. The product property for $D_1\times D_2$ for the pluricomplex Green function in the case when D_1 or D_2 is pseudoconvex was proved in [Jar-Pfl2]. Note that in [Jar-Pfl2] the authors used the description of the pluricomplex Green function given by M. Klimek.

Proof. The inequality "$\ge$" follows from the property (b). So, we have to prove "$\le$".

Let $(a_1,b_1),(a_2,b_2)\in D_1\times D_2$. Suppose that $N>0$ is such that

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$-TEX

$$\max\{g_{D_1}(a_1,a_2), g_{D_2}(b_1,b_2)\} < N. \tag{1}$$

It is sufficient to prove that

$$g_{D_1\times D_2}\big((a_1,b_1),(a_2,b_2)\big) < N.$$

There are holomorphic mappings $\varphi_1 : \bar{E} \to D_1$ and $\varphi_2 : \bar{E} \to D_2$ such that $\varphi_1(0) = a_2$, $\varphi_2(0) = b_2$,

$$\prod_{\lambda\in\varphi_1^{-1}(a_1)} |\lambda|^{\operatorname{ord}_\lambda(\varphi_1-a_1)} < N \quad \text{and} \quad \prod_{\lambda\in\varphi_2^{-1}(b_1)} |\lambda|^{\operatorname{ord}_\lambda(\varphi_1-b_1)} < N.$$

Note that if $\varphi : \bar{E} \to D_1$ is a holomorphic mapping, $\varphi(0) = a_2$, and $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l$ are zeros of $\varphi - a_1$ counted with multiplicities, then for a mapping

$$\widetilde{\varphi}(\lambda) := (\varphi - a_2)\frac{\prod_{j=1}^{l}(\lambda - \widetilde{\sigma}_j)}{\prod_{j=1}^{l}(\lambda - \sigma_j)}\frac{\prod_{j=1}^{l}\sigma_j}{\prod_{j=1}^{l}\widetilde{\sigma}_j} + a_2, \tag{2}$$

where $\widetilde{\sigma}_j$ is close enough to σ_j, $j = 1, \dots, l$, we have $\widetilde{\varphi} \in \mathcal{O}(\bar{E}, D_1)$. So, we may assume that $\operatorname{ord}_\lambda(\varphi_1 - a_1) = 1$ for any $\lambda \in \varphi_1^{-1}(a_1) \cap E$ and $\operatorname{ord}_\lambda(\varphi_2 - b_1) = 1$ for any $\lambda \in \varphi_2^{-1}(b_1) \cap E$.

Let $\{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_\nu\} = \varphi_1^{-1}(a_1) \cap E$ and $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\mu\} = \varphi_2^{-1}(b_1) \cap E$. We may assume that $|\zeta_1| < |\zeta_2| < \dots < |\zeta_\nu|$ and $|\xi_1| < |\xi_2| < \dots < |\xi_\nu|$, ν, μ are minimal. Then

$$|\zeta_1 \dots \zeta_\nu| \geq N|\zeta_\nu|^\nu \quad \text{and} \quad |\xi_1 \dots \xi_\mu| \geq N|\xi_\mu|^\mu.$$

For, if $|\zeta_1 \dots \zeta_\nu| < N|\zeta_\nu|^\nu$ then we may consider the mapping $\widetilde{\varphi}_1(\lambda) := \varphi_1(\zeta_\nu\lambda)$, and it contradicts the minimality of ν.

Assume that $|\zeta_1 \dots \zeta_\nu| < |\xi_1 \dots \xi_\mu|$. Then we consider the mapping

$$\widetilde{\varphi}_1(\lambda) := \varphi_1(t\lambda), \quad \lambda \in \bar{E},$$

where $t := \left(\frac{|\zeta_1\dots\zeta_\nu|}{|\xi_1\dots\xi_\mu|}\right)^{\frac{1}{\nu}}$. Then $\left|\frac{1}{t}\zeta_j\right| < 1$, $j = 1, \dots, \nu$, and

$$\left|\left(\frac{\zeta_1}{t}\right)\dots\left(\frac{\zeta_\nu}{t}\right)\right| = |\xi_1 \dots \xi_\mu|.$$

Hence, we may assume that $|\zeta_1 \dots \zeta_\nu| = |\xi_1 \dots \xi_\mu|$. Take $\widetilde{\varphi}_1(\lambda) = \varphi_1(e^{i\theta}\lambda)$, where θ is such that $e^{-i\theta}\zeta_1 \dots e^{-i\theta}\zeta_\nu = \xi_1 \dots \xi_\mu$. So, we may assume that $\zeta_1 \dots \zeta_\nu = \xi_1 \dots \xi_\mu$.

Put

$$B_1(\lambda) := \prod_{j=1}^{\nu}\frac{\zeta_j - \lambda}{1 - \bar{\zeta}_j\lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad B_2(\lambda) := \prod_{j=1}^{\mu}\frac{\xi_j - \lambda}{1 - \bar{\xi}_j\lambda}, \quad \lambda \in \bar{E},$$

and $C := B_1(0) = B_2(0)$. We have that $|C| < N$.

Put $A_1 := \{\lambda : B_1'(\lambda) = 0\}$, $A_2 := \{\lambda : B_2'(\lambda) = 0\}$, $A := B_1(A_1) \cup B_2(A_2)$, $\widetilde{A}_1 := B_1^{-1}(A)$, and $\widetilde{A}_2 := B_2^{-1}(A)$.

Put

$$\widetilde{B}_1(\lambda) := \frac{B_1(\lambda) - B_1(0)}{1 - \overline{B_1}(0)B_1(\lambda)}.$$

It holds

$$B_1(\lambda) = \frac{B_1(0) + \widetilde{B}_1(\lambda)}{1 + \overline{B_1}(0)\widetilde{B}_1(\lambda)}.$$

Note that $\widetilde{B}_1$ is a Blaschke product (because, it is a proper function), $\widetilde{B}_1(\lambda) = 0$ iff $B_1(\lambda) = B_1(0)$, and $\widetilde{B}_1'(\lambda) = 0$ iff $B_1'(\lambda) = 0$. Changing very little zeros of the $\widetilde{B}_1$, we may assume that it has no multiple zeros and $\widetilde{B}_1(0) = 0$. Then we have a new Blaschke product

$$\widehat{B}_1(\lambda) := \frac{B_1(0) + \widetilde{B}_1(\lambda)}{1 + \overline{B_1}(0)B_1(\lambda)},$$

such that $\widehat{B}_1(0) = B_1(0)$ and there is no $\lambda_0 \in E$ such that $\widehat{B}_1(\lambda_0) = \widehat{B}_1(0)$ and $\widehat{B}_1'(\lambda_0) \neq 0$. The zeros of the function $\widehat{B}_1$ are close enough to zeros of the B_1. So, we may assume that $C \notin B_1(A_1)$ (replacing B_1 by $\widehat{B}_1$ and φ_1 by $\widehat{\varphi}_1$, where $\widehat{\varphi}_1$ is constructed using (2)). In a similar way, we may assume that $C \notin B_2(A_2)$. Hence, $C \notin B_1(A_1) \cup B_2(A_2)$, and, therefore, $0 \notin \widetilde{A}_1 \cup \widetilde{A}_2$.

There exists a covering $\pi : E \to E \setminus A$ such that $\pi(0) = C$. Let us show that π is a Blaschke product, i.e.

$$\lim_{r\to 1} \int_0^{2\pi} \log|\pi(re^{i\theta})| d\theta = 0.$$

Suppose that there exists $\lim_{r\to 1} \pi(re^{i\theta}) = t$ for some $e^{i\theta} \in \partial E$. We want to prove that $|t| = 1$ or $t \in A$. Assume that $t \in E \setminus A$. Then there exists neighborhood V of t such that $\pi^{-1}(V) = \cup_j V_j$, $V_{j_1} \cap V_{j_2} = \varnothing$, $j_1 \neq j_2$. There exists r_0 such that $\pi(re^{i\theta}) \in V$, $r \in [r_0, 1)$. There exists j_0 such that $r_0 e^{i\theta} \in V_{j_0}$. Then $re^{i\theta} \in V_{j_0}$ for any $r \in [r_0, 1)$. Hence,

$$e^{i\theta} = \lim_{r\to 1} (\pi|_{V_{j_0}})^{-1} \circ \pi(re^{i\theta}) = \pi^{-1}(t) \cap V_{j_0}.$$

It is a contradiction. So, $|t| = 1$ or $t \in A$. Note that A is a finite set, hence $\lim_{r\to 1} \pi(re^{i\theta}) \in \partial E$ for a.a. $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$. Therefore, π is an inner function. Hence, $\pi = BS$, where B is a Blaschke product and

$$S(\lambda) = \exp\Big(- \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\lambda + e^{i\theta}}{\lambda - e^{i\theta}} d\sigma(\theta)\Big),$$

where $\sigma \geq 0$ on ∂E is a singular measure with respect to Lebegue measure and $S^*(\lambda) = 0$ for σ-almost all $\lambda \in \partial E$. We know that if exists $\lim_{r\to 1} \pi(re^{i\theta}) = t$, where $|t| < 1$, then $t \in A$. Hence, $t \neq 0$. So $\sigma = 0$ and $S \equiv 1$, therefore, π is a Blaschke product.

Note that $B_1|_{E\setminus \widetilde{A}_1} : E \setminus \widetilde{A}_1 \to E \setminus A$ and $B_2|_{E\setminus \widetilde{A}_2} : E \setminus \widetilde{A}_2 \to E \setminus A$ are finite coverings. Hence, there exist liftings $\psi_1 : E \to E \setminus \widetilde{A}_1$, and $\psi_2 : E \to E \setminus \widetilde{A}_2$ such that $\pi = B_1 \circ \psi_1 = B_2 \circ \psi_2$, $\psi_1(0) = \psi_2(0) = 0$.

We have that π is a Blaschke product. So, there exists $r < 1$ such that

$$\log|\pi(0)| - \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_0^{2\pi} \log|\pi(re^{i\theta})|d\theta < \log N. \tag{3}$$

Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s$ be solutions of the equation $\pi(r\lambda) = 0$ counted with multiplicity. By Jensen formula (cf. [Rud], Theorem 15.18) the left hand side of (3) is equal to $\sum_{j=1}^{s} \log|\lambda_j|$, and, therefore, $\sum_{j=1}^{s} \log|\lambda_j| < \log N$.

Put

$$\gamma(\lambda) := \big(\varphi_1 \circ \psi_1(r\lambda), \varphi_2 \circ \psi_2(r\lambda)\big).$$

Note that $\gamma : E \to D_1 \times D_2$, $\gamma(0) = (a_1, b_1)$, and $\gamma(\lambda_j) = (a_2, b_2)$. Hence,

$$g_{D_1 \times D_2}\big((a_1, b_1), (a_2, b_2)\big) \le \prod_{j=1}^{s} |\lambda_j| < N.$$

□

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Professors M. Jarnicki, P. Pflug, and W. Zwonek for helpful discussions and remarks.

References

[Gar] J. Garnett, *Bounded Analytic Functions*, Academic Press, 1981.
[Jar-Pfl1] M. Jarnicki & P. Pflug, *Invariant Distances and Metrics in Complex Analysis*, Walter de Gruyter, 1993.
[Jar-Pfl2] M. Jarnicki & P. Pflug, *Remarks on the pluricomplex Green function*, Indiana Univ. Math. Journal **44 (2)** (1995), 535-543.
[Pol] E. Poletsky, *Holomorphic currents*, Indiana Univ. Math. Journal **42 (1)** (1993), 85-144.
[Rud] W. Rudin, *Real and complex Analysis*, McGraw-Hill, 1974.

INSTYTUT MATEMATYKI
UNIWERSYTET JAGIELLOŃSKI
REYMONTA 4
30-059 KRAKÓW, POLAND
E-mail address: `umedigar@cyf-kr.edu.pl`